

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1 – 23 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0032151, hereinafter Paul, in view of US 2003/0184793, hereinafter Pineau.

Claim 1 defines an image processing apparatus that includes, among other things, an acquisition portion acquiring from a different image processing apparatus information including additional information and a comparison and display portion comparing the additional information acquired by said acquisition portion from said different image processing apparatus with additional information added by an information adding portion to said sortation memory portion, and displaying similar additional information. According to one preferred embodiment, a user can add additional information, such as a proposed box name, and then acquire information from another image processing apparatus and compare the newly added information to the acquired information. This process enables the user to avoid inadvertently entering duplicate names for different boxes.

Regarding claims 1 and 4, the Examiner alleges that Paul discloses an acquisition portion acquiring information from a different image processing apparatus, citing paragraphs [0031] – [0033]. The Examiner also alleges that Paul discloses a comparison and display portion comparing the additional information acquired by the acquisition portion, citing paragraphs [0032] – [0037]. The Examiner acknowledges that Paul does not expressly teach the claimed memory.

However, the Examiner's analysis is not understood, particularly with regard to the comparison and display features. Paragraphs [0032] – [0037] of Paul teach how a user can select a large image by clicking on a thumbnail image, and after the large image is displayed, the user can select from a number of options. There is no description of making a comparison, and no description of displaying any similar information. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection is based on a misunderstanding of Paul. In the event the Examiner persists with the current rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to set forth in much greater detail what two pieces of information in Paul are being compared to each other, and exactly what is being displayed as a result of such a comparison. Absent a more clear explanation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

Claim 4 defines an image processing apparatus that includes, among other things, "a comparison portion comparing the additional information acquired by said acquisition portion from said different image processing apparatus with the additional information added by said information adding portion to said sortation memory portion to acquire a result of said comparing". As set forth above with respect to claim 1, the cited portion of Paul does not teach or suggest such a comparison portion.

Claim 11 defines an image processing apparatus comprising, among other things, a notification portion notifying a different image processing apparatus of information registered by a registration portion; an acquisition portion acquiring from said different image processing apparatus information of an original stored in said different image processing apparatus at a sortation memory portion having registered therewith information identical to information imparted by said notification

portion; and a storage portion storing to said sortation memory portion information of an original acquired by said acquisition portion from said different image processing portion.

The Examiner simply refers to claim 1 for the description of how the applied art allegedly renders claim 11 obvious. However, the claimed combination that includes the notification portion, the acquisition portion, and the storage portion is clearly not taught or suggested by the applied prior art, and the Examiner has not provided any explanation as to where it may be taught.

The rejections of claims 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, and 22 are improper at least for one or more of the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 4, and 11.

Claims 13, 14, and 23 further include an erasing portion or an erasing step or act. The Examiner alleges that such feature is taught by Paul at paragraphs [0032] – [0037] and [0041].

However, the Examiner's analysis is again not understood, particularly with regard to the erasing feature. Paragraphs [0032] – [0037] and [0041] of Paul teach how a user can select a large image by clicking on a thumbnail image, and after the large image is displayed, the user can select from a number of options. There is no description of the claimed combinations that include the erasing feature.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection is based on a misunderstanding of Paul.

In the event the Examiner persists with any of the current rejections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to set forth in much greater detail what is being erased and how. Absent a more clear explanation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.


The remaining dependent claims define further features of the claimed invention and are patentable over the applied prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims from which they depend.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the rejections. In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 10, 2008

By: 
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620